

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,280	00,280 06/20/2003		Robert F. Lake JR.	7505-1	6345
30448	7590	01/03/2005		EXAMINER	
AKERMA]	N SENTI	ERFITT	JASTRZAB, KRISANNE MARIE		
P.O. BOX 3				, DT IDUT	DAREN NUMBER
WEST PAL	M BEACI	H, FL 33402-3188	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1744	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· ·		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
· ·		10/600,280	LAKE ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Krisanne Jastrzab	1744					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filled after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro						
Disposition of Claims								
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or							
Application Papers								
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 								
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
2) Notice 3) Inform	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 5/3/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa						

Art Unit: 1744

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5, 8-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

These claims are found to be vague and indefinite because they recite "said decontamination device" within the body of the claims, thereby improperly attempting to define the invention by itself. Such references should be changed to refer to specific, claimed structural components of the device, not the device itself. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 14, 19, 21 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Briggs, III et al., U.S. patent No. 5,641,464.

Briggs, III et al., clearly teach a method and apparatus for sterilizing a reuseable stethoscope with a device constructed to interactively receive the head of the stethoscope for sterilization thereof. See column 3 and the figures.

Art Unit: 1744

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sigler U.S. patent No. 5,722,537 in view of Briggs, III et al., '464.

Art Unit: 1744

Sigler teaches a portable device for decontaminating a pacifier constructed with a closeable receptacle containing an absorbent material loaded with disinfectant solution and configured to engagingly receive the nipple of a pacifier. The device is provided with hook or lanyard means to connect it to the pacifier even when not in use.

Briggs, III et al., teach the known and expected application of disinfecting the head of a stethoscope with a disinfectant solution.

It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to configure the device of Sigler such as to accommodate the head of a stethoscope for disinfection as in Briggs, III et al., because it would provide an effective portable system which can be carried with the stethoscope user for immediate, on-site disinfection between uses.

With respect to claims 9-11, it would have been well within the purview of one ordinary skill in the art to include use indicia on the portable device in order to determine the type of disinfectant applicable for re-loading the device.

With respect to claim 20, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to include indicator means identifying whether or not the disinfectant had contacted the stethoscope to assure the user that disinfection had occurred, and that disinfectant was still available for use.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisanne Jastrzab whose telephone number is 571-272-

Application/Control Number: 10/600,280

Art Unit: 1744

1279. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Wed. 6:30am-4:00pm and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert J. Warden can be reached on 571-272-1281. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Krisanne Jastrzab Primary Examiner Art Unit 1744 Page 5

December 21, 2004